

Hooksett Police Supervisors, NEPBA Local 38 and Town of Hooksett, Decision No. 2010-182 (Case No. G-0145-1).

The Union filed a WMA petition seeking to represent certain employees of the Police Department. The Town objected claiming that the proposed bargaining unit did not contain a minimum of ten employees as required under RSA 273-A:8, I, included supervisory, confidential and probationary employee, combined professional and non-professional employees contrary to RSA 273-A:8, II, and lacked a community of interest as required under RSA 273-A:8, I.

The PELRB denied the petition finding that the Executive Assistant was a confidential employee within the meaning of RSA 273-A:1, IX (c); that the Captains were supervisory employees within the meaning of RSA 273-A:8, II; and that because of the exclusion of the Executive Secretary and the Captains, the bargaining unit failed to satisfy a ten-employee minimum requirement under RSA 273-A:8, I.

Disclaimer: This summary is intended to provide a brief description of the issues in this case and the outcome. The summary is not a substitute for the decision, should not be relied upon in place of the decision, and should not be cited as controlling or relevant authority in PELRB proceedings or other proceedings.